

REMARKS

Claims 1-61 are pending in the application.

Claims 21-33, 41 and 54 are objected to and claims 1-20, 34-40, 42-53 and 55-61 are rejected.

Claims 36-55 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for lack of support for the "base game." The claims have been clarified the change the "base game" to the "hybrid game." The hybrid game is referred to in claims 1 as: a hybrid game comprising two different sub-games played simultaneously.

It is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify applicant's claimed invention. Claim 1 recites that the result of the reel game and the result of the pin and ball game combine to define a winning event of a preselected player reward being awarded. Claim 1 also has been amended to correct minor informalities. The feature is supported by the specification and does not comprise new matter.

As one example of such a result the pin and ball game may be substituted for a result in the reel game, thereby potentially increasing the value of the prize awarded by the reel game.

It is respectfully submitted the claim directed to the reel game outcome being combined with the pin and ball game outcome to define a preselected winning event is not suggested in the prior art for at least the below reasons.

Claim 3 has been amended to depend from claim 2.

Claim 5 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Minor informalities have also been corrected in claim 5.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 12-18, 26-28, 34-40, 42, 45-47, 49-52, 55 and 61 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Ugawa (5,836,819).

The Ugawa is relied upon to disclose a hybrid video game. In the Ugawa specification, a hybrid game is described in which the spinning reel game and the pinball game are independent, each capable of providing prize-winning outcomes which are apparently added together. Ugawa col. 33 line 62 to col. 34, line 12 discloses adding the result of the pin and ball game with the result of the reel game in order to arrive at a payout figure for each game.

What Ugawa is teaching is the prize-winning outcome of one game is added to a prize-winning outcome of another game to arrive at a combined payout figure.

This is different from applicant's claimed feature where a preselected player reward being awarded when the reel game outcome and the pin and ball game outcome combine to define a preselected winning event.

Ugawa is teaching adding the result of one game to the result of another game to provide a totaled combined result, whereas applicant is claiming the outcomes of each game combine to provide a preselected player reward.

What Ugawa does not disclose is a machine in which the results of the two games are interdependent, to provide a preselected result. The Ugawa solution teaches the reel prize and the pin and ball prize are simply added together to define a total game outcome. In contrast in applicant's claim to achieve a winning result the outcomes of each game are combined to achieve a preselected result. In Ugawa there is no interaction between the outcomes of the two games other than simply adding the results, there is no disclosure where the result of the reel game and the result of the pin and ball game combine to define a preselected winning event.

Applicant's rejected dependent claims include at least the features set forth above including additional distinguishing features. It is respectfully requested that the 102 rejection be withdrawn since the cited reference fails to teach each feature of applicant's claims.

Claims 3, 4 and 48 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa in view of Pierce et al. It is respectfully submitted that Pierce fails to teach the missing features of Ugawa as pointed out above with respect to claim 1. Therefore the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1.

Claims 6-8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa in view of Sines et al. (Sines). Claim 9 is rejected as unpatentable over Ugawa in view of Sines and further in view of Lynch et al..

Claim 6

Applicant's claim 6 includes wherein at least one substitution location is defined in the pin and ball game such that if a ball comes to rest at the substitution location a symbol is substituted for a symbol in the outcome line of the spinning reel game to assist in forming a prize winning combination.

Its admitted in the Office Action that Ugawa fails to describe a symbol is substituted for a symbol in the outcome line of the spinning reel game. Its asserted that Sines shows such a feature.

However Sines only suggests substitution within a single game. There is no suggestion in Sines that a substitution location in, for example, a pin and ball game is used for a symbol in the outcome line of the spinning reel game.

Sines does not disclose or even suggest a two game machine. Sines simply discloses a one game pin and ball machine in which the results of the pin and ball game are displayed in a reel game type format.

This features set forth in claim 6, defines the situation where a symbol in the reel game is substituted by a symbol selected via the pin and ball game to assist in forming a prize winning combination, which is not suggested in the combination of references.

In view of at least the foregoing it is respectfully requested the rejection of claims 6-11 be withdrawn.

Applicant's remaining rejected dependent claims 19, 20, 43, 44, 53, 56-60 are each rejected as being obvious over Ugawa in view of an additional reference. Applicant's rejected dependent claims include at least the features set forth above with regard to claim 1 including additional distinguishing features. It is respectfully submitted that the additional references fail to teach the missing features of Ugawa as pointed out above with respect to claim 1


For Example Adams describes a mechanical style pinball machine, combined with a spinning reel style slot machine, in which the score achieved in a pinball game provides a multiplier for multiplying the prize won on the spinning reel game. Thus one game provides a multiplier for the other game. This is different from providing the preselected player rewards being awarded when the game outcomes are combined...

Adams does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest any interaction between the spinning reel and pinball games beyond the multiplier function discussed above.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone:(212) 940-8703

Fax: 212-940-8696/8697

Docket No.: 3232/FRHL (333832-00002)

BSM.rm